

REMARKS

Claims 17 – 40 are pending in the application.

Applicant has amended claims 17, 19, 20, 26, 30, 36 and 38 in this response, and present arguments below so as to overcome the rejections set forth in the Office Action.

Specification

In section 1 of the Office Action the Examiner objected to the disclosure “because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code”.

It is understood that the objection relates to web link <http://web.mit.edu/zyi/www/pdf/IEEETrans2000.pdf> that appears in paragraph 0051 of the original specification. Paragraph 0051 has been replaced with a new paragraph that edits the URL so as to endure that it is not a valid browser-executable code structure but, is still discernable as a URL is appropriately modified.

Claim objections

In section 2 of the Office Action, claims 19, 29 and 30 were objected for informalities and are amended according to the Examiner’s recommendations.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

In section 2 of the Office Action, claims 20, 26 and 38 were rejected under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite.

Applicant has amended claims 20 and 38 to overcome the rejections by replacing the terms “is in a shape of a USB flash disc device” with the term “a USB dongle” as shown in the US design patent # D462,689 or D468,090 the contents of which were incorporated to the specifications by reference.

The Examiner objected to claim 26 for referring to a USB flash memory disk, which, according to the Examiner, lacks antecedent basis,

Applicant has amended claims 26 to overcome the rejections by amending claim 26 to include the limitation of operating software from the “emulated USB flash memory disk device, as described in parent claim 24. Additionally, an “s” has been added to the word “operate”.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

In sections 5 and 6 of the Office Action, claims 17-19, 21-23, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020118112 to Lang (Lang1).

Claim 17 is objected based on para 19 of Lang1 that teaches “a physiological parameter measurement sensor 15 worn or attached to the subscriber 11 and coupled to a wireless communication unit 20 worn or carried by the subscriber 11 or located nearby. Each wireless communication unit 20 is capable of transmitting digital data over a wireless communication network 40 ... to a wide area network 45 and eventually to a central computer 60 connected thereto.”

Applicant submits that Lang1 teaches a configuration that is opposite to the configuration described in Claim 7. Lang1 teaches a wireless communication unit that is connected (coupled) to the measurement sensor and communicating via a wide area network to a central computer. Claim 17 describes a portable wireless gateway (para b) that is connected to a computer (para c) and is wirelessly communicating with the measuring device (para a).

Additionally, the semicolon at the end of claim 17 is replaced with a fullstop.

Claim 17 is objected based on para 19 of Lang1 that teaches “a a central computer 60 connected to a wide area network 45”.

Applicant submits that Lang1 teaches a central computer that communicates, via the wide area network 45 and the wireless communication network 40 with the wireless communication unit 20, which corresponds to the portable wireless gateway of claim 17, while claim 18 contains the limitation of a central

computer that communicates via a computer network with the PC, which communicates with the portable wireless gateway.

As to claim 19, 21, and 22, it is submitted that these claims are allowable, as they are dependent from allowable Claim 17.

Claim 23 is objected on the basis that para 25 of Lang1 “teaches storing health information”.

Applicant submits that Lang1 teaches that “the subscriber 11 may access his or her medical database file 64”. However, according to Lang1, medical database file 64 is hosted in the central computer and not in the in the wireless communication unit 20, which corresponds to the portable wireless gateway as described in claims 23 and 21.

As to claims 29 and 30, it is submitted that these claims are allowable, as they are dependent from allowable Claim 17.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

In sections 7 and 8 of the Office Action, claims 20, 24-27 and 35-40 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being unpatentable over Lang1 in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020078367 to Lang (Lang2).

Firstly, applicant submits that Lang1 does not teach the limitation of claim 17, upon which claims 20, 24-27 and 35.

Claims 20, 24-27 are objected based on the assumption that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in the time that lang1 invention was made to include a portable device as taught by lang2.

As to claims 20 and 24, applicant submits that the use of the portable device, namely the portable wireless gateway emulating a USB flash memory disk device as described in claims 20 and 24, is connected to the computer (para (c) of claim 17) that is entirely lacking from Lang1. It is therefore not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in the time of lang1 invention to emulate a USB flash memory disk device. Furthermore, since the wireless communication unit 20 does not connect

to a computer it does not contain a USB port. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in the time of Lang1 invention to emulate a USB flash memory disk device with the wireless communication unit 20.

As to claims 25-27, it is submitted that these claims are allowable, as they are dependent from allowable Claim 24.

As to claim 35, it is submitted that this claim is allowable, as it is dependent from allowable claim 17.

On consideration of the Examiner's rejection of claim 36, Applicant has elected to amend Claim 36 to recite:

"a wireless communication unit operative to communicate with the measuring unit;" and

"a computer interface module operative to connect to the computer".

Both amendments are described in the original version of claim 36 in the paragraph starting with "wherein" and are added for clarity.

Applicant submits that Lang1 does not teach portable wireless gateway that is connected to a computer and is wirelessly communicating with a measuring unit. Therefore, Lang1, with or without Lang2, cannot anticipate the limitation of "connecting the portable wireless gateway to a computer the computer becomes a part of the remote medical monitoring system during the period of the connection."

As to claim 37-40, it is submitted that this claim is allowable, as it is dependent from allowable claim 36. Additionally, since the wireless communication unit 20 described by Lang1 does not connect to a computer it does not contain a USB port. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in the time of Lang1 invention to emulate a USB flash memory disk device with the wireless communication unit 20.

In light of the above, it is submitted that amended Claims 17, 19, 20, 26, and 30, and Claims 18, 21-25, 27-29, 31-35 dependent thereon, as well as amended claims 36 and 38 and claims 37, 39 and 40 dependent thereon, are not anticipated by Lang1 independently or in view of Lang2, and are, therefore, allowable.

All of the issues raised by the Examiner have been dealt with. In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are allowable over the cited reference. An early Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Smith Frohwein Tempel Greenlee
Blaha, LLC

By: Gregory Scott Smith